# **AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS WITHOUT MARKINGS**

# **IN THE DRAWING:**

Figs. 3-14 have been added.

#### REMARKS

The last Office Action of August 29, 2006 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of the instant application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 5-21 are pending in the application. Claims 6-12, 17-21 have been amended. Claim 5 has been canceled. Claims 22-35 have been added. A total of 30 claims is now on file. The claim surcharge of \$500.00 for presenting ten claims in excess of twenty is enclosed. Amendments to the specification have been made.

It is noted that the drawings are objected to because of applicant's failure to show every feature set forth in the claims. Drawing proposals showing the required changes are submitted herewith together and discussed further below.

It is further noted that claims 5, 8, 18, 20-21 are objected to because of informalities. This objection has been addressed, as suggested by the Examiner.

It is further noted that claims 5-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 5, 11-12, 14, 16-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 1,371,233 to Fries.

Claims 9-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fries.

Claims 5-6, 9, 11-12, 14, 17-18, 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 4,761,602 to Leibovich in view of Japanese Publ. No. JP 8-009606.

Claims 13 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fries or Leibovich and JP 8-009606, further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,399,949 to Penn.

It is noted with appreciation that claims 7 and 8 are indicated allowable if rewritten in independent form to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### **OBJECTION TO THE DRAWING**

In order to address the objection to the drawing, applicant submits herewith a new drawing sheet, labeled "NEW SHEET", illustrating new Figs. 3-14. Applicant wishes to note as follows:

Applicant has replaced the term "stranded wire" throughout the specification and claims with "stranded conductor" to more accurately reflect the German term "Litzenleiter" as used in the international PCT application PCT/DE2003/00437, of which the present patent application is the US-national phase application, and to be consistent throughout the specification. As is generally known, a stranded (or Litz) conductor is made up of a plurality of individual filaments which are twisted to form the stranded conductor. The pitch of the twisting can hereby be a function of the cross section of the stranded conductor and thus relates to the type of twisting. Applicant has added a new Fig. 3 to illustrate the "pitch", labeled with reference character "10". Support for the illustration of Fig. 3 can be found in paragraph [0014].

Newly submitted Figs. 4-6 show stranded conductors of different cross section, whereas newly submitted Figs. 7-9 show filaments of different cross sections. Support for the illustrations of Figs. 4-9 can be found in paragraph [0008].

Newly submitted Fig. 10 shows the alternating pattern of the stranded conductors L1, L2. Support for the illustration of Fig. 10 can be found in paragraph [0020].

Newly submitted Fig. 11 shows the provision of fan blades, labeled with reference numeral "6". Support for the illustration of Fig. 11 can be found in paragraph [0010].

Newly submitted Figs. 12-14 show various examples of providing an electric contact between the stranded conductors in the slot. Support for the illustration of Fig. 11 can be found in paragraphs [0015] and [0017].

The specification has been amended to make it consistent with the amendments to the drawing. No new matter has been added.

With respect to the shape of the holding elements (2), it is applicant's contention that Fig. 2 is clear enough for an artisan to understand the gist of the present invention, without requiring a detailed depiction of a ring-shaped or trough-shaped (or cap-like) configuration of the holding element. It is therefore applicant's belief that an additional illustration is not required for the understanding of the present invention.

Withdrawal of the objection to the drawing is thus respectfully requested.

### REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

With respect to the use of the language "running in opposite directions" as set forth in previously presented claim 5, the Examiner is advised that this language is desired to express the type of placement (or winding) of the conductors in the slots during manufacture. In rewriting claims 7 and 8 in independent form, applicant has followed the suggestion by the Examiner to refer to "placement" of the conductors.

The term "pitch" has been explained under the previous heading and represents a known term in the art to define the type of twisting involved. Thus, as shown in Fig. 3, the stranded conductors are twisted in a predetermined fashion in accordance with a particular pitch and, as the Examiner correctly surmised, in a non-random, uniform pattern. It is therefore applicant's contention that claim 6 is definite and clear.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph is thus respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b) AND §103(a)

Applicant has rewritten previously presented claims 7 and 8 in independent

form, as suggested by the Examiner, who indicated that originally filed claims 7

and 8 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form and if rewritten to

address the §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> para. rejection. Accordingly, applicant asserts that claims 7

and 8 have not been narrowed to trigger prosecution history estoppel. See Salazar

v. Procter & Gamble Co., 75 USPQ2d, 1369 (stating that introducing claim 7

based on the allowable subject matter of dependent claim 3 of the "149 application

was not a narrowing amendment for purposes of patentability and, therefore, does

not by itself give rise to prosecution history estoppel).

Claims 6, 9, 11-12 have further been amended to make them dependent on

claim 7, and claims 22-35 have been added to set forth the subject matter of

original claim 6, 9-21 but made dependent on claim 8.

Thus, it is applicant's contention that claims 7, 8 and 6, 9-35 are now in

condition for allowance.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §§102(b) and 103(a) and

allowance of claims 6-35 are thus respectfully requested.

**CLARIFICATION AMENDMENT** 

Applicant has replaced throughout the specification the term "armature" with

"lamination stack" to accurately reflect the German term "Blechpaket" as used in

the international PCT application PCT/DE2003/00437 of which the present patent

application is the US-national phase application. This change is self-explanatory

and does not contain any new matter.

**CITED REFERENCES** 

Applicant has also carefully scrutinized the further cited prior art and finds it

13

without any relevance to the claims on file. It is thus felt that no specific discussion

thereof is necessary.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above presented remarks and amendments, it is respectfully

submitted that all claims on file should be considered patentably differentiated over

the art and should be allowed.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully

requested.

Should the Examiner consider necessary or desirable any formal changes

anywhere in the specification, claims and/or drawing, then it is respectfully

requested that such changes be made by Examiner's Amendment, if the Examiner

feels this would facilitate passage of the case to issuance. If the Examiner feels

that it might be helpful in advancing this case by calling the undersigned, applicant

would greatly appreciate such a telephone interview.

Respectfully submitted,

Bv:

Henry M. Feiereisen Agent For Applicant

Reg. No: 31,084

Date: November 29, 2006

350 Fifth Avenue

Suite 4714

New York, N.Y. 10118

(212)244-5500

HMF:af

14